

# Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Spence, Ruth ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6197-9975>, Kagan, Lisa and Bifulco, Antonia ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8316-9706> (2019) A contextual approach to trauma experience: lessons from life events research. *Psychological Medicine*, 49 (9) . pp. 1409-1413. ISSN 0033-2917 [Article] (doi:10.1017/S0033291719000850)

Final accepted version (with author's formatting)

This version is available at: <https://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/26547/>

## Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this work are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge.

Works, including theses and research projects, may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from them, or their content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). They may not be sold or exploited commercially in any format or medium without the prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Full bibliographic details must be given when referring to, or quoting from full items including the author's name, the title of the work, publication details where relevant (place, publisher, date), pagination, and for theses or dissertations the awarding institution, the degree type awarded, and the date of the award.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:

[eprints@mdx.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@mdx.ac.uk)

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

See also repository copyright: re-use policy: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/policies.html#copy>

**A Contextual Approach to Trauma Experience: Lessons from Life Events Research**

Ruth Spence, Lisa Kagan, Antonia Bifulco

Centre for Abuse and Trauma Studies, Psychology Department, Middlesex University, London,  
UK

Corresponding author: Antonia Bifulco, Centre for Abuse and Trauma Studies, Psychology  
Department, Middlesex University, London, UK. Email: [a.bifulco@mdx.ac.uk](mailto:a.bifulco@mdx.ac.uk)

Word count: 3177

**Abstract**

There has been much debate over what constitutes trauma experience and how this is differentiated from other very negative life events in the diagnosis of PTSD. We believe the DSM implication that trauma events are uniquely different from other types of negative life events and are limited to a few specific types of predetermined event identified categorically hinders the utility of current trauma definitions in research and practice. Whilst we do not take issue with the standard definition of trauma events, a binary checklist-style approach to identifying such events has a potential for missing relevant experience. Instead, we argue that trauma events should be considered to be at one end of a continuum of threat/severity, with potential for more or less ‘threat to life’ in a range of domains. Furthermore, a wider assessment of events could elucidate a greater range of co-existing trauma events, those sub-threshold experiences related to phasing of trauma, and other unrelated negative life events which may contribute to context and impact.

In this critique of definitions of trauma events we argue that the current definition of PTSD criterion-A events limits their utility in both research and clinical practice. Following intensive life event assessments such as the LEDS (Life Events and Difficulties Schedule) the application of dimensions underlying a cross spectrum of events includes loss (of person, role, plan or ideas about the self), danger (future loss/threat to security), humiliation (devaluation of self/rejection) and entrapment (sense of imprisonment) can be used to further categorise events or trauma, and specify their likely impact. Data is provided of the overlap of ‘markedly’ threatening negative events (using the LEDS) and those constituting trauma using a commonly used checklist in a high-risk community sample of women. This yielded high specificity (97%; CI = 95.60-97.71) but low sensitivity (41%; (95% CI = 27.57-54.97) with around a third rated on both. Most of the

trauma events involved loss and danger categorisation and only in one instance humiliation. Other markedly threatening, non-trauma events, involved not only loss and danger but also humiliation and entrapment. We discuss how a more in-depth assessment of trauma events utilising these dimensions and with the new Computerised Life Events Assessment Record (CLEAR), could aid us in our understanding of trauma events and lead to more personalised treatment possibilities.

*Defining trauma*

There has been much debate over what constitutes trauma experiences, how these are differentiated from other very negative events, and the importance of personal impact – for example witnessing versus experiencing events. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (5th ed.; *DSM-5*; American Psychiatric Association, 2013) defines Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) trauma events specifically as those where the individual experiences, witnesses or is confronted with actual/threatened death, serious injury or sexual violence. Whilst experiencing a Criterion-A defined traumatic event is a necessary component of the PTSD diagnosis, it is clearly not a sufficient explanation of disorder risk. Studies show significant between and within event variation on disorder impact (Darves-Bornoz et al., 2008; Carmassi et al., 2014) suggesting that a) some trauma events are much more prone to provoking PTSD than others and b) that after experiencing the same trauma event-type some individuals will go on to develop PTSD while others will remain resilient. Therefore, trauma event characteristics as well as individual vulnerability are required to explain disorder risk.

Currently, individual factors such as sex, age and psychiatric history are known to increase the risk for developing PTSD (Brewin et al., 2000). However, refining our understanding of trauma events could also further help explain these differences (Kilpatrick et al., 2009). Indeed, further improving the specifics of trauma experiences might actually help reduce the discrepancy between the incidence of currently defined traumatic events and the much lower rate of PTSD cases found by epidemiological studies (Darves-Bornoz et al., 2008; Digangi et al., 2013; Camassi et al., 2014). Certainly, it is important to increase our knowledge of risk and resilience surrounding trauma, as PTSD is associated with some of the widest use of health care systems and a high associated cost per patient (Kessler 2000; Boscarino, 2004).

We believe the DSM implication that trauma events are uniquely different from other types of negative life events and are limited to a few specific types of predetermined event that can be identified categorically and of which only one or two may occur in a given case, hinders the utility of current trauma definitions in research and practice. Whilst we do not take issue with the standard definition of trauma events, a binary checklist-style approach to such events has a potential for missing relevant experience. Instead, we argue that trauma events should be considered to be at one end of a continuum of threat, with potential for more or less ‘threat to life’ in a range of domains. For example, a serious violent attack from partner with injuries sustained could be differentiated from lesser conflict and verbal threats which may precede it. Yet both are likely to add to the duration of threat and impact, and individuals seeking treatment may be at different phases in a developing scenario. Similarly witnessing violence may be considered less threatening (or of different valence) than being the recipient in many cases. Taking a wider assessment of adverse experience around an identified trauma with grading of ‘threat to life’ for the individual or another, can help to contextualise experience and predict or understand impact. This might help explain why some negative life events which fall short of current trauma definitions, such as certain instances of infidelity and relationship disturbances, can be related to risk of PTSD (Gold et al., 2005; Van Hooff et al., 2009; Catherall, 2011) and why traumatic events can fail to demonstrate this association if experienced indirectly (Anders et al., 2011). Furthermore, a wider assessment of events could elucidate a greater range of co-existing trauma events, or those sub-threshold experiences related to phasing of trauma, and other unrelated negative life events which may contribute to context and impact (for example reducing resources).

***A Contextual Approach to Severity***

Whilst there are a few intensive life events interview measures, largely developed in the 1980s and 1990s eg (Paykel, 1997) the Life Events and Difficulties Schedule (LEDS; Brown & Harris, 1978) has been utilised in a body of research and is often considered a ‘gold standard’ of this type of approach. The LEDS uses intensive interview questioning to provide an objective assessment of an event’s threat (i.e. where it sits on the spectrum of negativity) through close examination of the event itself, its context and the resulting inferred objective life change for the individual (Brown & Harris, 1978). This occurs through precedent ratings and some panel reviews for reliability purposes.

A ‘severe’ life event is one that involves an enduring or relatively extensive negative life change (with high score of threat or unpleasantness), including those requiring substantial cognitive reappraisal, lasting at least two weeks post-event and impacting either solely or jointly on the individual/ someone close (Brown & Harris, 1978). The level of threat (scored on a 4-point scale) is determined using information about both current circumstances and relevant past biography, as well as evidence for relevant plans, purposes and concerns held by the respondent at the time of the event (Brown, 1991). Rating of ‘marked’ threat is relatively unusual and involves aspects such as bereavement of someone close (i.e. where loss is permanent) or violent attack (i.e. where real physical danger is involved). This is all rated free from the actual emotional response or disorder occasioned and based on the response of the ‘average person’ in similar circumstances. Thus, it reflects factual information independent of symptomatology and emotional response about change, focusing on potential negative impacts.

However, to our knowledge, the theoretical grounding and methodology used in life events research have not been specifically applied to trauma exposure. Using life events procedures for identifying a wider range of negatively life changing events may serve to identify

multiple trauma experiences wider than those restricted to current Criterion-A definitions, identifying related severe events or chronic problems which add to the trauma context, severity and ‘dosage’ or explicate the causes of comorbid disorder can add to both research prediction and treatment focus.

The research on trauma implies that for many individuals, traumatic events occur within a context of other negative experiences such as ongoing deprivation or substance abuse (Hamel & Pampalon, 2002; Dong et al., 2004; Kim et al., 2010). Moreover, severe life events tend to cluster within the same individuals (Kendler et al., 1993; Foley et al., 1996; Bifulco et al., 1998). Thus, the clustering of severe events and their likely effect on coping/support resources may help explain why PTSD is frequently comorbid with other psychiatric diagnoses (Grubaugh et al., 2010; Contractor et al., 2014), as well as why events that do not meet Criterion-A can be related to PTSD (Bodkin et al., 2007; Van Hooff et al., 2009).

Severe events not reaching current trauma criterion evoke a range of emotional reactions such as anger, sadness and anxiety as well as negative cognitions around pessimism, self-doubt and hopelessness. This increase in general psychological distress can reduce an individual’s available coping resources, which in turn may increase the likelihood of psychological disorder in general. Indeed, it is well documented that severe life events are related to onset of major depression (e.g. Brown et al., 1995; Bifulco et al., 1998; McQuaid et al., 2000) and other psychopathology such as schizophrenia, eating disorders and bipolar disorder (Hultman et al., 1997; Schmidt et al., 1997; Hosang et al., 2012; Beards et al., 2013). Alternatively, a traumatic event may itself increase psychological distress reducing the ability to cope with other life events, further increasing distress and the likelihood of PTSD symptoms along with other



disorder. Therefore, it should be unsurprising to conclude that the co-occurrence of severe events with present or past trauma(s) could be important for both PTSD and comorbid psychopathology.

This is borne out by research which illustrates that experiencing a severe negative life event can add to the impact of trauma experiences (Brewin et al., 2000). Studies show that delayed PTSD onset is often associated with experiencing severe life events, sometimes many years after the initial trauma (Andrews et al. 2009; Boscarino & Adams, 2009; Horesh et al., 2011) and negative life events contribute to PTSD and depression comorbidity (Jin et al., 2018). Additionally, PTSD symptomatology increases after experiencing a subsequent severe life event or trauma (Schock et al., 2016).

This illustrates the importance for both clinicians and researchers to examine in detail not only the index trauma(s) but any stressful experiences surrounding the trauma. Those who fail to assess the impact of other contextual factors might misattribute the cause of distress or ignore their intersecting effects which could be decreasing resilience and increasing the likelihood of disorder, greater symptomatology or comorbidity.

### ***Possible Dimensions of Trauma Events***

Life events have also been analysed in terms of characteristics or dimensions which cut across the usual event categories (such as partner, housing, parenthood) (Brown et al., 1995) and these may be usefully attributed to trauma events. One of these is loss, defined broadly as the loss of a person (attachment threat), role (identity threat), important plan (achievement threat) or cherished idea about the self (identity threat). The permanence of such loss denotes higher severity ratings with bereavement having particular prominence. Although PTSD Criterion-A does not specifically mention loss, its inclusion of death, serious injury and sexual assault may

all involve aspects of loss, i.e. death breaks attachments, and injury or assault may lead to loss of role and functioning central to self-concept. Events involving emotional loss have been found to be significantly associated with PTSD symptoms above and beyond Criterion-A stressors (Carlson et al., 2013). This indicates not only that loss events provoke severe emotional pain of the sort consistent with Criterion-A, but suggests other loss events may additionally be considered traumatic. Certainly, bereavement is commonly associated with PTSD symptoms in the general population (Zisook et al., 1998; O'Connor 2010) even when non-violent, but with sudden and untimely elements such as the death of a child from chronic illness.

Danger events are those clearly indicating a future loss or security threat, threats to plans (achievement) and threats to ideas about the self, particularly when they are associated with behavioural commitment (identity), with those threatening to life and safety having highest severity. Similar to loss, it could be implied that the Criterion-A events of threatened death, injury or assault carry high weightings of danger to security and potentially identity and attachments. Cognitive models of PTSD argue that trauma events violate formerly held beliefs and lead to cognitive restructuring around concepts of safety and self-assessment (; Brewin, 2014). Indeed, individuals who experience threats to safety show a raised likelihood of PTSD, including war veterans and victims of stalking or natural disasters (Xu & Liao, 2011; Norris & Slone, 2013; Kessler et al., 2017). The perception of life threat is significantly associated with PTSD (Larsen & Berenbaum, 2017), even after adjusting for objective trauma exposure (Heir et al., 2016).

Another severe life event dimension, humiliation, involves rejection, devaluation and role failure (attachment and identity threats), leading to a sense of shame or devaluation with more public events and those in areas of high commitment being more severe. Feelings of anger,

shame and guilt are often associated with trauma, and humiliation may underlie some of the association between traumatic events and PTSD (Lee et al., 2001). For example, experiencing shame and anger at others after a violent event is predictive of PTSD (Andrews et al., 2000). More broadly, research suggests that negative social events involving public humiliation, ridicule or rejection can be experienced as more distressing than those meeting Criterion-A (Carleton et al., 2011) and lead to PTSD symptoms (Erwin et al., 2006; Guðmundsdóttir, 2016). There is also evidence that persistent humiliation can lead to significantly lower psychological functioning than periodic exposure to violence (Barber et al., 2016).

Entrapment is a characteristic of both severe events and related long-term problems, where there is erosion of hope with events confirming imprisonment in an ongoing, highly negative situation (security threat), with the most severe involving little chance of escape. Torture, hostage situations and domestic abuse are all cases which could easily fulfil Criterion-A but also have features of entrapment in the cultivation of hostile and punishing environments. Certainly, feelings of entrapment are significantly associated with PTSD (Griffiths et al., 2015; Siddaway et al., 2015) and are strongly related to suicidal behaviour in those with PTSD (Panagioti et al., 2012). These can encompass events not in themselves traumatic, such as carer experience, which can be associated with PTSD when involving perceptions of entrapment (van den Born-van Zanten et al., 2016). Similar findings hold for entrapping experiences of parents of children with chronic illnesses (Cabizuca et al., 2009) and victims of school and workplace bullying (Nielsen et al., 2015).

### ***Testing overlap of markedly severe events, their attributes, and trauma events***

In order to examine how attributes of severe events may overlap with trauma classifications, a secondary analysis of published data of LEDS events was undertaken. In a London community

sample of 110 vulnerable women seen prospectively (Bifulco *et al.*, 1998) the LEDS interview classified 1232 events. The analysis examined only those with the most ‘marked’ threat rating taken to be similar in severity to trauma events. A post hoc analysis applied the Life Events Checklist for DSM-5 (LEC-5; Weathers *et al.*, 2013) classification to summarised events (inter-rater reliability of  $\kappa = .90$ ) and found 4.4% of events meeting Criterion-A Trauma across 40 respondents. Most were physical assault (39%) or death/life threatening illness (28%). There were fewer sexual assaults (11%), accidents (13%), or severe human suffering (e.g. suicide attempt of other, stillbirth) (9%). Analysis showed that of those categorised as having LEC-5 trauma events, most (88%) had *also* experienced at least one other severe event as identified in the LEDS. Thus, trauma events and severe life events co-occur in the same respondents.

The overlap of ‘markedly’ severe life events and LEC-5 trauma events was further examined. This yielded 60 events across 22 respondents. There was modest agreement between the two scorings ( $\kappa = .36$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). The LEDS ‘marked threat’ rating had a specificity of 97% (95% CI = 95.60-97.71) but a sensitivity of only 41% (95% CI = 27.57-54.97) with the trauma classification, and a PPV of 37% and a NPV of 97%. Thus LEDS ‘marked’ threat events failed to detect 59% of trauma events, but incorrectly identified only 3%. The two measures are overlapping but by no means identical.

The examination of pre-rated severe events features (i.e. loss, danger, humiliation, entrapment) and LEC-5 trauma classification for this group of ‘marked’ threat events is shown in table 1. Nearly all those classified as trauma were scored additionally as having danger or loss with a further two categorised as humiliation. For non-trauma events there was a wider spread of classifications including humiliation and entrapment.

**Table 1 about here**

This brief analysis suggests trauma events commonly occur with severe life events, are a subset of events with marked threat and similarly have characteristics of loss, danger and humiliation.

The LEDS approach is thorough but very time consuming and therefore expensive. A new online approach – Computerised Life Events Assessment Record CLEAR – mimics aspects of the interview ratings with good reliability and validity and is able to provide ratings of threat as well as the further characteristics in a large number of event categories (Bifulco et al 2019). The overlap of trauma and other severe events and their characteristics have been investigated with some success in relation to depression (Bifulco et al under review). Whilst these scores constitute reported rather than investigator coded characteristics of events, aids to rating online through written and video instruction, and detailed labelling of rating points with examples, potentially objectifies ratings. In addition, the potential for providing algorithms for comparing detailed and time-based demographic information with to underpin severity ratings is present. Given trauma is a characteristic rated online this has potential for beneficial use in trauma-related research and services but requiring fewer resources than the intensive interview.

### ***Treatment implications***

There is already some support for the further specification of the trauma concept for PTSD along potential dimensions already used for severe life events research. Potentially, adopting both a dimensional approach to investigating what makes negative life events traumatic and what other attributes are particularly traumagenic would increase the breadth of experience encompassed but also the potential specific meaning of different subsets of trauma experience for the individual. Equally, this more qualitative or ‘meaning’ approach to understanding trauma would allow for a more considered approach when formulating treatment, placing the individual within their context at the time of the event but also in encompassing other related stressful

events which impinge on the individual but may also have implications for managing trauma (e.g. through loss of other close support figures).

Using greater specification in assessing characteristics of trauma events may aid not only in refining diagnosis but also in treatment or intervention. Thus, psychotherapeutic techniques appropriate to grief, over-vigilance, damaged self-concept or helplessness can be used to supplement those already available for less specified trauma. Whether or not the trauma situation is ended/ resolved or still active is relevant for appropriate levels of vigilance experienced. Any of these approaches would also potentially benefit from a detailed knowledge of other severe life events or long-term problems still in evidence which may create further future risk or limit support or resource (escape from a violent partner also involving loss of home and financial support). Whilst intensive interviews may be ruled out for time and resource issues, an online assessment of severe life events and trauma, based on the LEDS and undertaken outside of clinician time may aid in improved treatment approaches as well as client understanding of their experience (Bifulco et al, 2019). Failing this, clinicians simply being aware of distinctions in trauma characteristics (regarding loss, danger, humiliation and entrapment) and applying these to the trauma situations described, may find new themes for treatment. This would not necessarily involve extensive questioning, rather a deeper understanding of components of an identified trauma experience.

### ***Conclusions***

We have argued that trauma events should be considered in more varied terms, for example on a spectrum of magnitude, in relation to phasing and tied to contextualised life event threat approaches. Specifically, we have highlighted the potential significance of loss, danger, humiliation and entrapment when rating the traumatic nature and likely impact of events. These

attributes may be crucial in refining our understanding of not only why some events are considered traumatic, but their specific impacts, for instance the likely repercussions of a traumatic loss compared to traumatic danger such as ongoing violence.

In addition, we have argued the importance of both current and longer-term context is critical, especially as negative experiences including traumatic events tend to cluster within individuals and their effects can have multiple and cumulative impacts. Critically, traumatic experiences are rarely isolated events and the unique impact of any given trauma may be difficult to ascertain. We believe a dimensional approach to characteristics of trauma taken from life events research could have potential for greater clarification of trauma attributes and severity. This would have direct implications for more a person-focused treatment of trauma. It could also inform predictions of future life trajectories to distress and disorder.

## References

- American Psychiatric Association.** (2013). *The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (5th ed.; DSM–5)*. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Anders S, Frazier P, Frankfurt S** (2011). Variations in Criterion A and PTSD rates in a community sample of women. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders* **25**, 176-184.
- Andrews B, Brewin CR, Rose S, Kirk M** (2000). Predicting PTSD symptoms in victims of violent crime: The role of shame, anger, and childhood abuse. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* **109**, 69-73.
- Barber BK, McNeely C, Olsen JA, Belli RF, Doty SB** (2016). Long-term exposure to political violence: The particular injury of persistent humiliation. *Social Science & Medicine* **156**, 154-166.
- Beards S, Gayer-Anderson C, Borges S, Dewey M, Fisher H, Morgan C** (2013). Life Events and Psychosis: A Review and Meta-analysis. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* **39**, 740-747.
- Bifulco A, Brown G, Moran P, Ball C, Campbell C** (1998). Predicting depression in women: The role of past and present vulnerability. *Psychological Medicine* **28**, 39-50.
- Bifulco, A., Kagan, L., Spence, R., Nunn, S., Hosang, G. M., Taylor, M., & Fisher, H. L.** (under review). Characteristics of severe life events, attachment style and depression – using a new online approach.
- Bifulco, A., Spence, R., Nunn, S., Kagan, L., Rodriguez D., Hosang G.M., . . . Fisher, H. L.** (2019). The Computerised Life Events and Assessment Record (CLEAR) online measure of life events: reliability, validity and association with depression. *JMIR Mental health*, 6(1), e10675. doi:10.2196/10675



- Bodkin JA, Pope HG, Detke MJ, Hudson JI** (2007). Is PTSD caused by traumatic stress? *Journal of Anxiety Disorders* **21**, 176-182.
- Boscarino J.** (2004). Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and physical illness: Results from clinical and epidemiologic studies. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1032**, 141-153.
- Boscarino JA, Adams RE** (2009). PTSD onset and course following the World Trade Center disaster: findings and implications for future research. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* **44**, 887–898.
- Brewin C.** (2014). Episodic memory, perceptual memory, and their interaction: foundations for a theory of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Psychological Bulletin* **140**, 69-97.
- Brewin C, Andrews B, Valentine J** (2000). Meta-analysis of risk factors for posttraumatic stress disorder in trauma-exposed adults. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* **68**, 748-766.
- Brown GW** (1991). A psychosocial view of depression. In *Community Psychiatry* (ed. D. Bennett and H. Freeman), pp. 71-114. Churchill-Livingstone: London.
- Brown GW.** (2002). Social roles, context and evolution in the origins of depression. *Journal of Health & Social Behavior* **43**, 255-276.
- Brown GW, Harris T** (1978). *Social Origins of Depression - A study of psychiatric disorder in women*. Tavistock: London.
- Brown GW, Harris T, Hepworth C** (1995). Loss, humiliation and entrapment among women developing depression: A patient and non-patient comparison. *Psychological Medicine* **25**, 7-21.

**Cabizuca M, Marques-Portella C, Mendlowicz MV, Coutinho ESF, Figueira I (2009).**

Posttraumatic stress disorder in parents of children with chronic illnesses: A meta-analysis.

*Health Psychology* **28**, 379-388.

**Carleton RN, Peluso DL, Collimore KC, Asmundson GJ (2011).** Social anxiety and

posttraumatic stress symptoms: the impact of distressing social events. *Journal of Anxiety*

*Disorders* **25**, 49-57.

**Carlson E, Smith S, Dalenberg C (2013).** Can sudden, severe emotional loss be a traumatic

stressor? *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation* **14**, 519-528.

**Carmassi C, Dell'Osso L, Manni C, Candini V, Dagani J, Iozzino L, Koenen KC, de**

**Girolamo G (2014).** Frequency of trauma exposure and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder in

Italy: analysis from the World Mental Health Survey Initiative. *Journal of Psychiatric*

*Research*, **59**, 77-84.

**Catherall D. (2011).** The impact of lower magnitude stressors on child and adolescent

development: The Family Context. In *Post-traumatic syndromes in childhood and*

*adolescence. A handbook of research and practice* (ed. V. Ardino), pp. 63-76. John Wiley &

Sons, Ltd: Chichester.

**Contractor AA, Durham TA, Brennan JA, Armour C, Wutrick HR, Frueh BC, Elhai JD**

(2014). DSM-5 PTSD's symptom dimensions and relations with major depression's symptom

dimensions in a primary care sample. *Psychiatry Research* **215**, 146-153.

**Darves-Bornoz JM, Alonso J, de Girolamo G, de Graaf R, Haro JM, Kovess-Masfety V,**

**Lepine JP, Nachbaur G, Negre-Pages L, Vilagut G, Gasquet I (2008).** Main traumatic

events in Europe: PTSD in the European study of the epidemiology of mental disorders

survey. *Journal of Traumatic Stress* **21**, 455-462.

- Digangi J, Guffanti G, McLaughlin K, Koenen K** (2013). Considering trauma exposure in the context of genetics studies of posttraumatic stress disorder: a systematic review. *Biology of Mood & Anxiety Disorders* **3**, 2.
- Erwin BA, Heimberg RG, Marx BP, Franklin ME** (2006). Traumatic and socially stressful life events among persons with social anxiety disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders* **20**, 896–914.
- Foley D, Neale M, Kendler K** (1996). A longitudinal study of stressful life events assessed at interview with an epidemiological sample of adult twins: the basis of individual variation in event exposure. *Psychological Medicine* **26**, 1239-1252.
- Griffiths AW, Wood AM, Maltby J, Taylor PJ, Panagioti M, Tai S** (2015). The development of the Short Defeat and Entrapment Scale (SDES). *Psychological Assessment* **27**, 1182-1194.
- Guðmundsdóttir K** (2016). The impact of social trauma among outpatients with social anxiety disorder compared to individuals with no mental disorders. University of Iceland, Department of Psychology: Unpublished Candian psychology thesis. Retrieved 27<sup>th</sup> September 2018 from <https://skemman.is/bitstream/1946/24878/1/Cand.psych%20lokaverkefni%202016.pdf>
- Hamel D, Pampalon R** (2002). Trauma and deprivation in Quebec. *National Public Health Institute of Quebec*
- Heir T, Blix I, Knatten CK** (2016). Thinking that one's life was in danger: Perceived life threat in individuals directly or indirectly exposed to terror. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* **209**, 306-310.

- Horesh D, Solomon Z, Zerach G, Ein-Dor T** (2011). Delayed-onset PTSD among war veterans: the role of life events throughout the life cycle. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* **46**, 863-870.
- Hosang G, Uher R, Maughan B, McGuffin P, Farmer A** (2012). The role of loss and danger events in symptom exacerbation in bipolar disorder. *Journal of Psychiatric Research* **46**, 1584-1589.
- Hultman, C. M., Wieselgren, I., & Öhman, A.** (1997). Relationships between social support, social coping and life events in the relapse of schizophrenic patients. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 3-13.
- Jin Y, Sun C, Wang F, An J, Xu J** (2018). The relationship between PTSD, depression and negative life events: Ya'an earthquake three years later. *Psychiatry Research* **259**, 358-363.
- Kendler K, Neale M, Kessler R, Heath A, Eaves L** (1993). A twin study of recent life events and difficulties. *Archives of General Psychiatry* **50**, 789-796.
- Kessler R** (2000). Posttraumatic stress disorder: The burden to the individual and to society. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* **61**, 4-12.
- Kessler R, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Alonso J, Benjet C, Bromet EJ, Cardoso G, Degenhardt L, de Girolamo RV, Ferry F, Florescu S, Gureje O, Haro JM, Huang Y, Karam EG, Kawakami N, Lee S, Lepine JP, Levinson D, Navarro-Mateu F, Pennell BE, Piazza M, Posada-Villa J, Scott KM, Stein DJ, Ten Have M, Torres Y, Viana MC, Petukhova MV, Sampson NA, Zaslavsky AM, Koenen KC** (2017). Trauma and PTSD in the WHO World Mental Health Surveys. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology* **8**.
- Kilpatrick D, Resnick H, Acierno R** (2009). Should PTSD Criterion A be retained? *Journal of Traumatic Stress* **22**, 374-383.

- Kim MM, Ford JD, Howard DL, Bradford DW** (2010). Assessing trauma, substance abuse, and mental health in a sample of homeless men. *Health & Social Work* **35**, 39-48.
- Larsen SE, Berenbaum H** (2017). Did the DSM-5 improve the traumatic stressor criterion?: Association of DSM-IV and DSM-5 Criterion A with Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Symptoms. *Psychopathology* **50**, 373-378.
- Lee DA, Scragg P, Turner S** (2001). The role of shame and guilt in traumatic events: A clinical model of shame-based and guilt-based PTSD. *British Journal of Medical Psychology* **74**, 451-466.
- Matthiesen SB, Einarsen S** (2004). Psychiatric distress and symptoms of PTSD among victims of bullying at work. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling* **32**, 335-356.
- McQuaid J, Monroe S, Roberts J, Kupfer D, Frank E** (2000). A comparison of two life stress assessment approaches: Prospective prediction of treatment outcome in recurrent depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* **109**, 787-791.
- Nielsen MB, Tangen T, Idsoe T, Matthiesen SB, Magerøy N** (2015). Post-traumatic stress disorder as a consequence of bullying at work and at school. A literature review and meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* **21**, 17-24.
- Norris FH, Slone LB** (2013). Understanding research on the epidemiology of trauma and PTSD. *PTSD Research Quarterly* **24**.
- O'Connor M.** (2010). PTSD in older bereaved people. *Aging & Mental Health* **14**, 670-678.
- Panagioti M, Gooding P, Taylor PJ, Tarrier N** (2012). Negative self-appraisals and suicidal behavior among trauma victims experiencing PTSD symptoms: The mediating role of defeat and entrapment. *Depression and Anxiety* **29**, 187-194.
- Paykel, E. S.** (1997). The interview for recent life events. *Psychological Medicine*, 27(2), 301-310.

- Schmidt U, Tiller J, Blanchard M, Andrews B, Treasure J** (1997). Is there a specific trauma precipitating anorexia nervosa? *Psychological Medicine* **27**, 523-530.
- Schock K, Böttche M, Rosner R, Wenk-Ansohn M, Knaevelsrud C** (2016) Impact of new traumatic or stressful life events on pre-existing PTSD in traumatized refugees: results of a longitudinal study. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology* **7**.
- Siddaway AP, Taylor PJ, Wood AM, Schulz J** (2015). A meta-analysis of perceptions of defeat and entrapment in depression, anxiety problems, posttraumatic stress disorder, and suicidality. *Journal of Affective Disorders* **184**, 149-159.
- Van den Born-van Zanten SA, Dongelmans DA, Dettling-Ihnenfeldt D, Vink R, van der Schaaf M** (2016). Caregiver strain and Posttraumatic Stress symptoms of informal caregivers of intensive care unit survivors. *Rehabilitation Psychology* **61**, 173-178.
- Van Hooff M, McFarlane A, Baur J, Abraham M, Barnes D** (2009). The stressor Criterion-A1 and PTSD: A matter of opinion? *Journal of Anxiety Disorders* **23**, 77-86.
- Weathers, F.W., Blake, D.D., Schnurr, P.P., Kaloupek, D.G., Marx, B.P., & Keane, T.M. (2013). *The Life Events Checklist for DSM-5 (LEC-5)*. Instrument available from the National Center for PTSD at [www.ptsd.va.gov](http://www.ptsd.va.gov)
- Xu J, Liao Q** (2011). Prevalence and predictors of posttraumatic growth among adult survivors one year following 2008 Sichuan earthquake. *Journal of Affective Disorder* **133**, 274-280.
- Zisook S, Chentsova-Dutton Y, Shuchter SR** (1998). PTSD following bereavement. *Annals of Clinical Psychiatry* **10**, 157-163.



Table 1: The number (%) of LEDS 'marked' severity and Criterion-A traumatic events classified by each threat type in a London sample (Bifulco et al 1998).

	LEDS Highest Rated Threat Dimension ('marked')				Total (n)
Type of Marked Event	Loss	Danger	Humiliation	Entrapment	
<b>Trauma LEC-5 event (n=22)</b>					
Actual/threat of death	5 (20.0)	7 (35.0)	--	--	12
Actual/threat of serious injury	2 (8.0)	5 (25.0)	2 (28.6)	--	9
Actual/threat of sexual violence	--	1 (5.0)	--	--	1
<b>Non-trauma event (n=38)</b>					
Disability and Death (eg serious chronic illness child, or sudden, untimely but non-violent death of close other)	5 (20.0)	1 (5.0)	--	1 (12.5)	7
Relationship crisis/breakdown (eg 14-year old child ran away following row and missing in London)	7 (28.0)	3 (15.0)	2 (28.6)	--	12
Crime/legal (eg individual arrested for murder)	3 (12.0)	1 (5.0)	3 (42.8)	--	7
Material/finance (eg made homeless)	2 (8.0)	2 (10.0)	--	4 (50.0)	8
Body image (eg disfigurement following illness)	1 (4.0)	--	--	3 (37.5)	4
<b>Total</b>	25	20	7	8	60